

No. 9 (1)-82-8Lab/1209.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Haryana State Electricity Board, Kurukshetra.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 233 of 1981

between

SHRIMATI SAVITRI DEVI, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT-MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARYANA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD, KURUKSHETRA

Workman in person with Shri D. P. Pathak.

Shri S. S. Sarohi for the respondent-management.

AWARD

This reference No. 233 of 1981 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/AMB/64/81/44840, dated 2nd September, 1981 under section 10 (1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shrimati Savitri Devi, workman and the respondent-management of M/s Haryana State Electricity Board, Kurukshetra. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shrimati Savitri Devi was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is she entitled ?

After receiving this reference, notices were sent to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, issues were framed on 16th November, 1981. On 14th January, 1982 when the case was fixed for the evidence of the respondent-management, the representative of the respondent made a statement in this Court that the respondent was ready to take the workman Shrimati Savitri Devi on duty with continuity of service and the period of her absence from duty would be treated as leave of the kind due. He further stated that the workman would be taken on duty on previous terms and conditions of her service. He also stated that the workman would resume her duty within one month. This statement was duly admitted by the workman or her representative. In the light of the above statement of the parties. I hold that there is no dispute between the parties on the issue so referred to this Court for adjudication. I give my award accordingly. No orders as to costs.

Dated the 22nd January, 1982.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 254, dated the 29th January, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the request that the receipt of the above said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9(1)82-6Lab/1210.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Executive Engineer, O. P.-Cum-Construction Sub-Division, Haryana State Electricity Board, Thanesar (Kurukshetra).

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 228 of 1981

between

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA DEVI APPLICANT, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT-MANAGEMENT OF M/S EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, O. P.-CUM-CONSTRUCTION SUB-DIVISION, HARYANA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD, THANESAR (KURUKSHETRA)

Workman in person with Shri D. P. Pathak.

Shri S. S. Sarohi, for the respondent-management.

AWARD

This reference No. 228 of 1981 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana—*vide* his order No. ID/AMB/63/81/41252, dated 26th August, 1981 under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shrimati Shakuntla Devi, workman and the respondent management of M/s Executive Engineer, O.P.-Cum-Construction Sub-Division, Haryana State Electricity Board, Thanesar (Kurukshetra). The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shrimati Shakuntla Devi was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is she entitled ?

After receiving this reference, notices were sent to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, issues were framed on 16th November, 1981. On 14th January, 1982 when the case was fixed for the evidence of the respondent management, the representative of the respondent made a statement in this Court that the respondent was ready to take the workman Shrimati Shakuntla Devi on duty with continuity of service and the period of her absence from duty would be treated as leave of the kind due. He further stated that the workman would be taken on duty on previous terms and conditions of her service. He also stated that the workman would resume her duty within one month. This statement was duly admitted by the workman or her representative. In the light of the above statement of the parties. I hold that there is no dispute between the parties on the issue so referred to this court for adjudication. I give my award accordingly. No orders as to costs.

Dated the 22nd January, 1982.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 253, dated the 29th January, 1982

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the request that the receipt of the above said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9(1) 82-6Lab/1211. - In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Secretary, Haryana State Electricity Board, Chandigarh, (ii) Superintending Engineer, Karnal Circle, H.S.E.B. Karnal.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER,
LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 162 of 1981

between

SHRI SUBODH KUMAR JAIN, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT-MANAGEMENT OF
M/S. SECRETARY, HARYANA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD, CHANDIGARH, (ii) SUPER-
INTENDING ENGINEER, KARNAL CIRCLE, H. S. E. B., KARNAL

Shri D. P. Pathak, for the workman.
Shri S. S. Sarohi, for the respondent management.

AWARD

This reference No. 162 of 1981 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana—*vide* his order No. ID/KNL/129-80/21762, dated 27th April, 1981 under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Subodh Kumar Jain, applicant-workman and the respondent management of (i) M/s Secretary, Haryana State Electricity Board, Chandigarh, (ii) Superintending Engineer, Karnal Circle, H.S.E.B., Karnal. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Subodh Kumar Jain, was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

After receiving this reference, notices were sent to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, issues were framed on 7th October, 1981. On 14th January, 1982, the date fixed in the case, the representative of the respondent-management made a statement that the respondent was ready to take the workman Shri Subodh Kumar Jain, on duty with continuity of service and period of his absence from duty would be treated as leave of the kind due. He further stated that the workman would be taken on duty on previous terms and conditions of his service. He also stated that the workman would resume his duty within a month. This statement was duly admitted by the workman himself or his representative. In the light of the above statement made by the parties, I hold that there is no dispute between the parties on the issue so referred to this court for adjudication. I give my award accordingly. No orders as to costs.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Dated the 22nd January, 1982.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 252, dated the 29th January, 1982

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the request that the receipt of the aforesaid award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9(1)82-6Lab/1277. In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. K. K. Engineering Works, Mujessar, NIT, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 202 of 1981

between

SHRI RAM DARESH YADAV WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. K. K.
ENGINEERING WORKS, MUJESSAR, NIT, FARIDABAD

Present :

Shri Nagesh Singh for the workman.

Shri Ravinder Kumar for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/64/80/30969, dated 26th June, 1981, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. K. K. Engineering Works, Mujessar, NIT, Faridabad and its workman Shri Ram Daresh Yadav, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Daresh Yadav was justified and in order ?

If so, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties issues were framed. But on the last date of hearing the management filed a settlement Ex. M. 1. According to the settlement the workman received Rs. 450 from the management in full and final settlement for going his right of reinstatement and reemployment and other dues, if any. The representative for the workman also agreed to it. In view of the settlement filed by the management and statements given by the parties, I give my award that the dispute has been settled between the parties.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 104, dated 29th January, 1982

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.